

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, 18, 20, 25, 30, 37, 46, 48, 52, 56 and 62 have been amended. Claims 1-69 are pending in this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

The Specification stands objected to based on informalities. The Office Action has requested that the serial/patent number of the related U.S. Patent applications cited on pages 15 and 19 be updated. Applicant has amended the appropriate paragraphs and submits that the applications referred to on pages 15 and 19 are currently pending. Moreover, Applicant has amended another paragraph beginning on page 28 to reflect the serial number of another co-pending application related to the present application. The objection should be withdrawn in light of these amendments.

Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that “said master bit buckets” recited on line 1 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 46 has been amended to address the concern raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 46 allowed.

Claims 1-35, 37-46, and 48-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Blackmon et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,513,091, hereinafter “Blackmon.” The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites a method of transferring data in a processor based system. The system includes a hub device connected to a first device by a link bus having a status line. According to claim 1, the method comprises the acts of “obtaining a status of [an] initiated transfer by observing the status line during a second predetermined window of time; and determining from the obtained transfer status whether the initiated data transfer should be stalled.” Applicant respectfully submits that Blackmon does not disclose, teach or suggest the recited method.

Blackmon, by contrast, relates solely to a method of determining the address of destination devices without storing address range registers within a network switch of the system. According to Blackmon, the removal of address range registers from the switch increases the switch's efficiency (Col. 2, lines 32-44). Since the switch does not have the registers, address status lines are used to determine how to route data transfers. Thus, when a transfer initiating device initiates a transfer, all possible destination device must return an address status. The address status has four values: (00) address parity error; (01) retry; (10) address acknowledged; and (11) null. A combining logic circuit gathers all of the returned address status values and determines which device is the appropriate destination (i.e., the device returning the "address acknowledged" value). Only then will the switch be able to route the data (Col. 3, line 50 to Col. 4, line 56).

There is no disclosure of any type discussing what the Blackmon system does once the transfers are initiated. There is no disclosure or teaching of any device or method for monitoring an initiated transfer. As such, there can be no teaching of a mechanism for determining if the initiated transfer should be stalled based on such monitoring. The address status lines used in the Blackmon system relate solely to determining the address of the destination device and nothing more. Thus, Blackmon cannot disclose, teach or suggest "obtaining a status of [an] initiated transfer by observing the status line during a second predetermined window of time; and determining from the obtained transfer status whether the initiated data transfer should be stalled" as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Blackmon. Claims 2-17 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1. Claims 18-35, 37-46 and 48-64 each recite similar limitations as claims 1-17 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 36, 47, 65, 66 and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackmon. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 36, 47,

Application No.: 09/730,774

Docket No.: M4065.0405/P405

65, 66 and 68 each recite similar limitations as claims 1-17 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The Office Action is silent with respect to claims 67 and 69. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 67 and 69 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: July 10, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No. 28,371

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No. 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant